

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies extended in the recent in-person interview conducted in connection with this application. The amendments and remarks presented herein are consistent with those discussed in the interview. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, mailed January 28, 2008, considered and rejected claims 1-48. In particular, claims 21-41 and 44-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, and claims 1-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being confusing by defining each of a system, process, and method.¹ Additionally, claims 1-11, 14-16, 21-34, 39-44 and 46-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Ganesh* (U.S. Patent No. 6,295,610), and claims 12, 13, 17-20, 35-38 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of *Ganesh* in view of *Craig* (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,708) or *Kesler* (U.S. Patent No. 7,062,502).²

As discussed during the interview, Applicant's claims generally relate to methods and computer program products for executing a transaction that includes direct methods to perform the transaction and that can at least partially reverse the effects of the direct methods of the transaction. As recited in claim 1, for example, such a method includes the creation and maintenance of a mapping between groups of direct methods and corresponding groups of inversion methods. After creation of the mapping, a transaction is begun. A group of direct methods is run as part of the transaction. Also within the transaction, the mapping is used to identify the corresponding group of one or more inversion methods corresponding to the direct methods. The identity of the corresponding group of inversion methods is then recorded in a compensation record for the transaction.

¹ As discussed during the interview, claim 21 has been amended to recite that the computer-executable instructions are stored, thereby rendering the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 overcome. Also, Applicant has further clarified the preambles of the independent more clearly identify a method or computer program product, as appropriate. In particular, while each method or computer program product claim identifies a computing system in which it can be performed or executed, the claim is nonetheless clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that it is merely the method or computer program product, particularly in view of the final statement of the preamble clarifying that it is the method or computer program product that includes the attendant elements.

² Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

Independent claim 21 recites a computer program product generally corresponding to the method of claim 1. Additionally, claim 42 recites a method having similar claim elements, but further defining various aspects, including the structure of the mapping and compensation records, and the manner in which the transaction is initiated.

As was also discussed during the interview, while *Ganesh* generally describes performance of a transaction and the storage of undo data items that include specific changes made during the transaction, so that such changes can be undone, it fails to anticipate or render obvious the pending claims, for at least the reasons that *Ganesh*, whether cited alone or in combination with the art of record, fails to disclose or reasonably support that when a direct method is run, the identity of the corresponding group of inversion methods is stored in a compensation record. Indeed, as was discussed, *Ganesh* appears to disclose the opposite, namely that when its "undo data" is stored, the changes are stored. In other words, *Ganesh* appears to disclose that the results of the direct operation are stored, rather than the storage of the inversion method that can undo the stored changes.

Furthermore, the Office asserts that the mapping corresponding to undo data and that is mapped with arrowed lines (in Fig. 7A-2) connecting a transaction list to an undo sequence also recites the maintenance of a mapping as previously recited. Applicant notes, however, that the amended claims clarify that the mapping itself is created before the transaction is begun. Thus, the mapping itself can be created independently of any transaction. This is in direct contrast to *Ganesh* in which the mapping in Fig. 7A-2 connects the transaction list to an undo sequence. In order to have the transaction list, the transaction must have therefore been initiated prior to creation of the mapping, such that *Ganesh* does not teach, support, or even enable, the creation of a mapping between direct and inversion groups at a time before the transaction to be undone is begun.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant submits that *Ganesh* fails to anticipate or render obvious the pending claims. Such is further the case whether *Ganesh* is cited alone or in combination with *Craig* and/or *Kesler*. For example, *Craig* describes a general system for the caching of dynamic content such as dynamically generated Web pages. *Craig* does not, however, relate to, or otherwise describe or suggest, any transaction-based system or the undoing of all or part of a transaction. Rather, *Craig* was asserted for the general proposition that HTTP is disclosed. (Office Action, pp. 21, 22). *Kesler* is primarily recited for teaching a SOAP


message and the passage of parameters through SQL. (Office Action, pp. 22, 23). Applicant notes, however, that nothing in *Kesler* appears to be related to the storage of inversion methods, the use of parameters for effecting inversion methods, or even the general nature of transactional processing.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 28th day of July, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
COLBY C. NUTTALL
Registration No. 58,146
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973